

money for their campaigns for national political office. That is how I always understood the law. That is the way I have conducted fundraising activities, in strict accordance with that interpretation, yet the committee's record is full of evidence that fundraising calls were made from the White House.

There are other issues of illegal activity which the committee has yet to fully explore. Recently, the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York obtained guilty pleas from three individuals involved in the last Teamsters election. These individuals apparently will testify that the Democratic National Committee and the AFL-CIO were used in efforts to launder money from the union's treasury into the reelection of Ron Carey, the Teamsters' president. I am not here alleging that he knew of it or that he was a party to it. I am merely reciting what I know from the reports from the guilty pleas and other things occurring in that court.

The Democratic National Committee apparently entered into an agreement with the Teamsters to launder money in exchange for contributions to the party from members of the union.

We have heard a lot about the union's role in the last election, and I share the concern expressed by my colleagues. But it seems to me that we need to get to the bottom of the criminal allegations, not just change the law to deal with their political activity.

I would like to make one point about unions and their activities in the last election. We all know that unions spent at least \$35 million on issue ads in 44 congressional districts during the 1996 campaign. Compared to the unions, Republican groups spent a pittance. Citizens for Reform, a group which was created to counter the unions, spent \$2 million in 15 districts. The coalition, Americans Working for Real Change, spent \$5 million. The unions spent \$700,000 in 1 week for advertisements. This is their privilege. This is their right. I do not seek to limit them. I only seek to make sure that a balance is maintained between the exercise of that right and the exercise of rights by others. So the unions have decided, because the current law gives them an advantage, that they are able to take a portion of their money dues without consent and use these dues for political activities.

Some want to call the Lott amendment a poison pill. I believe the vote, if we do have one on that issue, is a vote for fairness and balance. I believe that all contributions and paid political speech ought to be voluntary.

According to some, the law related to fundraising on Federal property was designed to prevent Government officials from coercing political contributions from Federal employees. Should the same rule against political contributions being done without consent apply to everyone, businesses, unions, PAC's and all?

On both sides of this issue I have listened as attentively as I can. I think

this has been a very civilized debate, worthy of the institution of the Senate. But I have yet to hear anything that convinces me that passing this bill, which will erode free speech rights of candidates, parties and groups, is necessary to enhance our electoral process.

Clearly, the bill takes us in the wrong direction, away from the first amendment and from our free, fair and open electoral system that is the envy of the world.

I would like to make one last point. Everyone here recognizes the many problems we are addressing today stem from the fact that the Supreme Court struck down various provisions in the post-Watergate reforms that were passed in 1974 and upheld others. I wish to caution Senators that the McCain-Feingold bill, although earnest in its attempt to correct the errors of the past, fails to take heed of the history of reforms of the past and is destined to lead us in the wrong direction and on a course to make many of the same mistakes.

This bill contains a severability clause that essentially means if certain provisions of this bill are held unconstitutional, the remainder of the act shall not be affected by the rest of the holding. Although I do not agree with the approach in this bill, I do believe that those who will vote for this bill believe that it will somehow level the playing field. If that is their interest, I ask them to very carefully examine the consequences of the title VI severability clause. If the Supreme Court holds that the bright-line rule created by this bill is unconstitutional, which I believe they will, we will not only have succeeded in increasing the inequities between the haves and the have-nots, but we will have also created a Pandora's box, full of new problems.

I thank the Senate for its attention.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business, Friday, October 3, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,411,881,420,892.37. (Five trillion, four hundred eleven billion, eight hundred eighty-one million, four hundred twenty thousand, eight hundred and ninety-two dollars and thirty-seven cents)

One year ago, October 3, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,222,192,000,000. (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-two billion, one hundred and ninety-two million)

Twenty-five years ago, October 3, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$434,091,000,000 (Four hundred thirty four billion, ninety-one million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly \$5 trillion (\$4,987,790,420,892.37) (Four trillion, nine hundred eighty seven billion, seven hundred ninety million, four hundred thousand, eight hundred ninety-two dollars and thirty seven cents) during the past 25 years.

A POETIC TRIBUTE TO TOBACCO GROWERS BY PEM PFISTERER CLARK

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, criticism of and attacks on the tobacco industry—and, by implication, tobacco growers—has become a sort of one-upmanship cottage industry among politicians who, in earlier days, scrambled to pay their respects to those engaged in growing tobacco and manufacturing it. The name of the game is "piling on" and the political types are doing it with gusto.

Last month, Mr. President, Dot Helms and I attended a meeting of the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Association at Williamsburg. The distinguished speaker at the dinner was Fred Barnes, one of today's most respected journalists.

Presiding at the dinner was an impressive young lady, Pem Pfisterer Clark, general manager of the Stemming District Tobacco Association in Henderson, KY.

During the program, Ms. Clark recited a touching poem she had written about tobacco farmers. To those of us whose States produce tobacco, so heatedly maligned by its turncoat one-time friends, Pem Clark's tribute to these farmers was something that needed saying—and she said it well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Pem Clark's poem be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

TRIBUTE TO GROWERS

Ladies . . . gentleman . . .

My mission now tonight

Is to share from my perspective

My thoughts on this "Tobacco Fight".

I represent a group of folk

Who dedicate their lives

To producing the very plant

On which this industry survives.

Here's a billion dollar business

That we hold to our hearts,

That's sprouting from God's smallest seed.

Now, that's a very humble start!

It's not by chance or accident

That from the well-worked earth,

A rich and leafy plant springs forth

That boasts of quality and worth.

A farmer can't put on his crop

By tossing out some seeds.

Even a "city slicker" knows

That all that guy will grow are weeds.

The work is toil, the labor long.

He plants and hoes and sprays.

And weary, he goes in at night

And sighs, and bows his head and prays.

At this point he's done all he can;

Now it's not up to him.

A lot of what will happen now

Depends on Mother Nature's whim.

The drought will come, pests and disease.

It's like a game of craps.

The sun, the wind, the rain, the hail . . .

But farmers, see, are used to that.

Relief! The crop is made. It's good.

The first fight fought he wins.

His crop stands healthy in the field,

But now the real hard work begins.

The harvest is back-breaking work.

Good help is hard to find.

The farmer says his prayers again . . .

"No mold, house burn. Good cure, this time".